

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 27, 2008. Claims 24-32 are presented for examination, having been added in place of Claims 13-15, 17-19 and 21-23, which have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 24, 27 and 30 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 13, 14, 17, 18, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,361,332 (Yoshida et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0002063 (Oomura et al.), and Claims 15, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from *Yoshida* in view of *Oomura* and of U.S. Patent 5,699,524 (Ooshi et al.).

Cancellation of the rejected claims renders the existing rejections moot. Applicant submits that the newly-presented independent claims, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 24 is directed to a font downloading apparatus for downloading a font to a printer that prints using a font conversion table defining correspondence between character codes of respective code systems and character codes of Unicode. The apparatus of Claim 24 comprises first and second obtainment units and a designating unit. The first obtainment unit obtains code systems supported by the printer, the designation unit designates a font to be downloaded, and the second obtainment unit obtains the code system of the font designated by the designation unit. A determination unit determines whether or not the code system obtained by the second obtainment unit is included in the code system obtained by the first obtainment unit, and a display unit displays a selection window for accepting a user selection of a code system from a list of the code systems obtained by the first obtainment unit

when the determination unit determines that the code system obtained by the second obtainment unit is not included in the code systems obtained by the first obtainment unit. Also provided is a download unit, which downloads the font designated by the designation unit. Also, according to Claim 24, the Unicode character codes included in the font conversion table of the code system selected on the selection window are assigned to character patterns of the font designated by the designation unit. Support for the language of this claim is found at least in steps S202 - S210 of Fig. 2, and in Fig. 1, and the corresponding description.^{1/}

Yoshida relates to an information processing device that obtains font information held by a connected device, and device type information, and downloads the font after converting the data format of the font into a format supported by the device when a font manager of the converted device is not coincident with the present font manager of the information device. Certain features of Claim 24 are absent from *Yoshida*, as is correctly noted by the Office Action (discussing the language of canceled Claim 13).

Oomura relates to a system that has a table defining correspondence relation between character codes of a certain code system and Unicode character codes, and a converting apparatus for converting Unicode into a glyph index, that is, character codes assigned in correspondence with each glyph.

In contrast, the apparatus of Claim 24 has, among other notable features, the recited download unit, which is “configured to download the font designated by the designation unit, wherein the character codes of Unicode included in the font conversion table of the code

^{1/} It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

system selected on the selection window are assigned to character patterns of the font designated by the designation unit.”

In particular, Applicant does not see how a person of merely ordinary skill would have arrived at the feature that “the character codes of Unicode included in the font conversion table of the code system selected on the selection window are assigned to character patterns of the font designated by the designation unit” from any consideration of *Yoshida* and *Oomura*, separately or in combination. Because of this, at the least, Applicant strongly believes that the structure recited in Claim 24 is not merely an obvious variant of either *Yoshida* or *Oomura*, or of any possible combination of the teachings of those two documents.

By virtue of the quoted language, the apparatus of Claim 24 has the effect that the printer can print even in a situation where the print job calls for the font of a special code system that is not supported by the printer, by substituting for the characters defined in the code system incompatible with the printer with characters in a compatible code system, chosen by the user from among code systems that are available in the printer. Applicant refers again to an example mentioned in a previous paper. Assume that a user tries to print a target document written in Tibetan, but that the target printer does not support Tibetan. In such case, by virtue of the quoted feature, the claimed apparatus replaces the unsupported characters (the Tibetan characters) with Unicode characters that can be converted into character codes belonging to a selected code system, for example Latin 1, and then the font can be downloaded by the claimed apparatus. This effect is not provided by the systems of either *Yoshida* or *Oomura*, and it is not seen how one of ordinary skill would arrive at the ability to provide this effect merely from those two documents. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Claim 24 is allowable over *Yoshida* and *Oomura*, taken separately or in any possible combination.

Independent Claims 27 and 30 are method and computer-readable medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 24, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 24.

A review of the other art of record, including *Oishi*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200